

we will be resolute. We still are strongly committed to trying to get legislation that is responsible and that will be effective. We still await any opportunity that might come up to try to offer whatever judgments that we might have that can move this process forward in a way which would deserve strong bipartisan support for this legislation.

It is a complex and a difficult issue. But there is no reason in the world that we can't do it, and do it before the end of this session. But to do so, we have to have the doors and windows opened up for the public's involvement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, obviously, we are not going to be able to do any more business between now and the scheduled recess for the two parties to meet. As a consequence, I ask unanimous consent that the recess scheduled to begin at 12:30 begin immediately.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:19 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 5353, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 20 minutes equally divided remaining prior to a motion to table the Bumpers amendment.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me explain to my colleagues the difference between this amendment and my amendment that you voted on earlier this year. In March, I offered an amendment that increased the Federal grazing fee for all permittees and those who controlled more than 2,000 animal unit months paid a higher fee. This amendment is different. I have raised the ante to provide that, unless a permittee controls 5,000 animal unit months, he is totally unaffected by my amendment. In fact, any permittee who controls less than 5,000 animal unit months pays the present grazing fee.

Let me go back. What is an animal unit month? When you lease lands to

graze cattle on Federal lands, you lease it by what is called an AUM, or animal unit month. That is the amount of grass it takes to feed one cow and her calf for 1 month. Some ranchers, for example those in southern Arizona and New Mexico, graze 12 months a year. However, most of the permittees only graze 4 or 5 months because there is not any grass in the winter months. So you can calculate, based on the current rate of \$1.35 an AUM, how much a permittee is paying.

Why is this important? It is not the money. It is the principle. Mr. President, grazing occurs on 270 million acres of our Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands, all Federal lands belonging to the taxpayers of this country—270 million acres. 97 percent of the people who hold grazing permits on those 270 million acres, and there are 22,350 total operators, are unaffected by the Bumpers amendment. Even the other 3 percent, who are the really big boys, are unaffected on the first 5,000 AUM's.

In other words, if you have 6,000 AUM's on your permit, for the first 5,000 you would pay the same rate you are paying right now, but on the extra 1,000 you pay whatever rate you would have to pay if you leased State lands in that particular State where the lands lie.

What does that amount to? It means, for example, that the average on State lands is \$5.58. In Colorado the rate is \$4.04. So you pay the difference in Colorado lands for every AUM over 5,000, and you would pay \$4.04.

Who are these people? Who are these 3 percent that have these AUM's? I will show you. I want you to bear in mind we passed a rather harsh welfare bill here just recently. The poorest of the poor in this country took it on the chin, and yet here is the biggest corporate welfare ripoff going on in America.

Who are these people that have more than 5,000 AUM's? And can they afford to pay more? If they lease State lands, they pay \$5.58. If they lease private lands they have to pay \$11.20. If they lease Federal lands it is \$1.35. Can they afford it? Here is Zenchiku, a Japanese corporation, 40,000 acres, 6,000 AUM's. Newmont Mining Co., the biggest gold mining company in the world, 12,000 AUM's. William Hewlett of Hewlett-Packard, 100,000 acres and 9,000 AUM's. Anheuser-Busch, one of the 80 biggest corporations in America, 8,000 AUM's. So I ask you, can these people—J.R. Simplot, in Idaho, an Idaho billionaire, a multibillionaire that controls 50,000 AUM's. Can Mr. Simplot, who is worth billions, afford to pay maybe \$2.50 more for all his cows above 5,000?

Mr. President, this national ripoff has been going on for almost 50 years. In March the offer I made to the Senate was anything above 2,000 AUM's, and I lost by three votes. So yesterday I amended my amendment to make it 5,000 hoping I could at least cause three people to change their minds about

this. It is a terrible thing for us to continue to allow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 6 minutes has expired.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I believe Senator CRAIG will be down here shortly. I ask that the Chair inform me when I have used 5 minutes, if you would, please, Mr. President.

Mr. President, first of all, there are very different ways in which the public domain is used from the standpoint of grazing permits. It happens in a State like mine we have 5,000 permittees. The overwhelming number are small ranchers. And they use, for the most part, the public domain for 12 months out of the year.

So the amendment that Senator BUMPERS is talking about uses this big number, 5,000 animal unit months, which is really about 400 head of cattle if you graze on the public domain for 12 months out of the year. So it sounds like a monster, but in States like mine it is a relatively modest cattle ranching operation.

Second, to say to those who ranch on the Federal land, "You may be asked to pay the same as the State fee for this land," not only invites a fee schedule that is different from State to State, but the State leases its land on completely different rules than the Federal Government.

Yesterday, in a few minutes on the floor, I suggested that if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas would like to make the public domain in a sovereign State subject to the same inhibitions and/or restrictions that the State land has, then maybe some consideration might be given to charging a State fee.

Let me give you a major example. In one of the States, the State land cannot be used for anything other than grazing, if you lease it for grazing, everyone else is denied access to that land. You cannot get on it for recreation. You cannot get on it for hunting and fishing. But we have decided on the public domain that we lease our land under completely different conditions. We lease for grazing, and it is still open to hunting and fishing and to the building of habitat for wild game and for fish.

So the argument that there is some kind of advantage and some kind of reality and some kind of logic to saying, let us charge what the State's charge is, ignores the fact that the State leases its land under completely different rules, regulations, conditions, and inhibitions.

Additionally, we do not need two sets of fees. We do not need a fee for the rancher in northern New Mexico who has 200 head of cattle and up the road

for somebody who has 600 head of cattle a different fee schedule. That is subject to manipulation. Even the Department of the Interior, when we suggested it before, said it will not work to have two separate sets of fees. I am not here defending large versus small, but clearly, we do not need that. I gave some examples yesterday of how that might work. It would come out with very large corporations being able to pay the lower fee and very small, independent operators with 450 head having to pay a higher fee.

Last, but not least, an amendment comparable to this was introduced last year. It failed. We took a comprehensive bill to the House. That bill changes some of the rules and regulations and increases the fee about 40 percent. We believe you need to change the rules and regulations before you increase the fees. That is pending between the House and the Senate. And to come along on an Interior appropriations bill and change the fee schedule, as recommended, does not seem to this Senator to be the thing to do at this time.

So when the time is up, I will move, on behalf of all of those who have supported the grazing reform and the defeat of a similar amendment, I will move to table it. I hope that the Senate will respond by letting this matter lie where it is, an argument now between the House and the Senate on a comprehensive reform bill which also will provide for very significant increases in grazing fees. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my opposition to the Bumpers amendment to raise grazing fees on public lands. The future of many livestock producers in Utah and elsewhere in the country is threatened by this amendment.

I am not aware of any cattle producers in Utah who will be making a profit this year. At the same time as Utah ranchers are facing dismally low prices for their cattle, they have been hit with a devastating drought. On top of this, economic conditions in Canada and Mexico have flooded our United States market with their cattle.

Ranchers who have grazed these lands for generations are being forced to pull up their stakes and close up shop. With the cattle industry in such bad shape, many agricultural lenders, aware of the possibility of increased grazing fees on public lands, have become increasingly unwilling to lend to livestock producers. An increase in grazing fees now could be devastating.

This amendment would exempt ranchers from higher fees who have permits for fewer than 5,000 AUM's, or animal unit months. Animals are numbered and accounted for by animal unit months. An AUM represents a unit of forage that is normally consumed by one cow and her calf or five sheep over a 1-month period. Unlike many States, Utah public lands are grazed in the summer and the winter. A rancher

owning as few as 500 head of cattle and grazing them for 10 months would need 5,000 AUM's. Such a rancher would be subject to these higher fees. Especially hard hit by this amendment would be Utah's beleaguered sheep grazers, a large proportion of whom would be faced with these higher fees.

Grazing fee increases will accomplish little more than to drive many family ranchers out of business. Of course, some private land owners charge more than the Federal Government for grazing on their lands. Private owners provide services which public lands do not. The Federal Government does not stock water ponds, provide fences, or provide roads. Ranchers using the public lands must provide these things for themselves at their own expense.

Mr. President, this amendment will not result in increased revenue from public lands. It will more than likely decrease revenue as ranchers who can no longer afford to use public lands find other options or go out of business.

I might add, Mr. President, that there are few other options for grazing land in Utah. The BLM controls 22 million acres of land in our State. The Federal Government controls 70 percent of our State.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote to maintain what is not only an important part of our Western heritage, but an important sector of the economy of many Western States. The next time my colleagues sit down to a nice juicy steak or to a hamburger with their kids at the local fast food restaurant, I hope my colleagues will remember that some rancher worked hard to produce it and may have even lost money for this effort.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to oppose the Bumpers amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have certainly enjoyed over the years the spirited debates in which I have engaged with my good friend from the State of Arkansas. He is a most passionate and articulate representative of his constituents and he is certainly a credit to them. In the debate over raising grazing fees on ranchers who use the public lands, however, I find myself pining for a new subject. We have oft been down this road before. We have heard it all; about how those rotten billionaire ranchers are ripping off the American people; about how they are overgrazing and ruining the lands; about how we should have a progressive fee system that would hit some ranchers hard and leave others alone; about the inequity of rates charged for Federal versus State lands. It is all "old hat."

Mr. President, I commend Senators THOMAS, CRAIG, DOMENICI, BURNS and all the others who have spoken out against this poor idea. I would be hard pressed to express my objections more cogently than they have done. Let me just underline a few concerns that those of us from Western States share with regard to this issue.

And these concerns are many. Indeed, I dare say that I cannot see one virtue in this amendment. To begin with, let there be no doubt about it: This amendment is not an effort to inject fairness into public lands grazing. Rather, this is the effort of interests who want nothing more than to get private ranchers off of public lands. "Cattle free in '93" was the clarion call during the last Presidential election of those who hold this view. Fairness? What is fair about it? As my good friend and colleague from the State of Idaho has pointed out, if it is fairness this amendment is after, then all parties should be paying the same rate, rather than pitting one class against the other. Of course, those of us on this side of the aisle are not surprised by this pitch: It is just such attempts to engender class warfare that those on the other side of the aisle have excelled at for 10 these many years. Fairness? What is fair about penalizing success? What is fair about discouraging small ranchers from becoming successful ranchers? The supporters of this amendment moan that the taxpayers aren't getting their money's worth out of our ranchers. How much money do they think will be returned to the Treasury when many of these ranchers go out of business because they have been barred from these lands—and again let me stress: This is most assuredly their ultimate goal.

Environmentalists are forever trying to sell the American people a quick Persian rug about "enviro dollars," and all of the money just waiting to be generated by tourism. Good heavens. In Western States like mine the tourist season on these lands is only a few months long at best. And has it occurred to no one what tourist jobs pay? Unless you own the motel you are probably making five bucks an hour changing bed sheets. Colonial Williamsburg, just a couple hours drive south of here, is one of the healthiest tourist enterprises in the country, yet there are people with 15 years seniority there who topped out long ago at eight or nine dollars an hour. The chimera of Tourism as a substitute for natural resource use on our public lands is one of the great hoaxes perpetrated on the American people by environmentalists. I guarantee you that tourism will not return more money to the Treasury than grazing lease holders.

But perhaps most offensive about the effort to rid our public lands of private ranchers is the fact that Western States are owned to an enormous degree by the Federal Government: My State of Wyoming—52 percent; Idaho—63 percent; Nevada—a whopping 87 percent. What are the people of the West to do but use these lands? Eastern States are not owned by the Federal Government to near this degree. Nor is the State of Arkansas, as my friend from Idaho has pointed out.

Fairness? What is fair about charging the same to graze on BLM lands as that charged on State and private

lands? BLM land users have to furnish their own improvements; fences, culverts, water tanks. They must contend with public access to their herds. They have tighter restrictions on what predators they can and cannot control and a host of other differences.

Mr. President, this amendment is neither fair nor prudent. We have defeated it before and I encourage my colleagues to defeat it again. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields to the Senator?

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time remains on our side and on Senator BUMPERS' side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 4 minutes, 53 seconds remaining; the Senator from Arkansas has 3 minutes, 42 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield all of my time to Senator CRAIG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me echo again what the Senator from New Mexico has just said. This is a fascinating precedent being established here in this amendment by the Senator from Arkansas, precedent in the way we would sell public resources.

Never before have we said to a large timber company, "You're going to pay a premium for the tree because you're larger," and to the smaller timber producer, "You'll pay less." We have never said to a rich person who walked into a national park, "You're rich, so you'll pay more." And we have never said, therefore, to the poor person, "You will pay less." We have always established what we believed was a fair market price for the value of the public resource. That is your job, Mr. President, and that is mine.

This past year we made every effort to accomplish that. We debated it long and loud in the committee that the Senator from Arkansas and I are members of. We agreed and disagreed; and we came back again and structured another provision to reform. It had a fee increase in it for all parties who would lease the public's grass.

But what the Senator from Arkansas is saying is, "If you're rich, this blade of grass for your cow will cost you more than if you are less rich." You and I both know that deciding who is rich and who is not rich is very arbitrary. Sometimes you can own 1,000 head of cattle, and owe the bank \$5 million, and have a net worth of nearly zero. That happens in the cattle business on occasion. I doubt that the Senator from Arkansas would call that rich, because if that individual rancher liquidated, there may be nothing left, especially after estate taxes and all of those kinds of things.

But the important issue here is that the Senate heard the need from the public to raise the grazing fees and to reform grazing, and we did, and the Senate acted.

I do not know where the Senator from Arkansas is coming from at this moment other than for the political sound bite for the up and coming campaign, because it is precedent setting, very precedent setting, to argue that we will divvy up the blades of grass of the public domain by who is rich and who is poor, and we will use that as a determination. We have never done it in any other way of selling a public resource, and we all recognize the importance of marketing public resources to get a fair and effective return to the Treasury.

Mr. President, that is what this Senate did. I think we ought to be proud of that work. Now, to attempt an end run around that effort, an end run that is precedent setting and totally unbalanced, is, without question, in my opinion, the wrong way to go. It divides the grazing communities of the West. It should not be allowed to do that. It totally rearranges what has been a historic arrangement that has stabilized the West and brought good stewardship to the public lands.

The stewardship now recognized by the Department of the Interior has resulted in better conditions on Western grazing lands than in the last 100 years. We, as trustees of that public domain, ought to be proud of that because we have insisted that stewardship go forward.

Now, that stewardship is a product of the relationship of the permittee—that is, the rancher who has the permit that leases the grass that grazes the cattle—that stewardship resulted in the quality of the rangeland we now have. If you break it up into a rolling crap shoot of a kind that has been proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, that stewardship goes away. No longer do you have the kind of longevity in grazing that goes from generation to generation with the clear recognition that that has produced quality stewardship, quality rangeland, quality wildlife habitat, and by the Department of Interior managers' own admission, the best conditions in rangelands in 100 years.

Mr. President, I hope we could table this amendment. I think it is wrong. I think it is unfair to divide the rich and the poor and establish that kind of an argument. If we do that, I think you and I will want to come back here and say to the millionaires that walk into our national parks, "You are rich, you pay more; for those on food stamps, if you can get to the parks, you pay less."

That that should not be the way we do it, but that is what is being proposed here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The Senator from Arkansas has 3 minutes and 42 seconds remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment, which is not about rich and poor, but about

marketplace economies and capitalism, which made this country great. Basically, what we have here is a program which essentially allows people to take advantage at an extraordinarily low rate, a subsidized interest, paid for by the taxpayers of America.

Mr. President, \$58 million a year is spent on this land. The United States gets back \$14 million. What we are suggesting is that for those people who use this land excessively, who have a large number of AUM's that exceed the 97 percent of the people who are not going to be impacted, just the top 3 percent of the people using this land, who use it to such an extensive rate, that those people should pay a rate that is a higher rate.

Today's rate is 43 percent less than what was paid in 1980. What we are suggesting is a rate which does not even account for what the inflation increase would be had that 1980 rate not been brought forward. It is a reduced rate, even by the simple terms of reflecting back to the 1980's and adding inflation.

We are suggesting a rate much closer to fairness, to equity, that gives to the taxpayers of this country, all of whom happen to own this land—it is not just owned by folks in the West—a reasonable return on the investment they are making.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Idaho alluded to what fair market prices are. If you live in Idaho—the Senator from Idaho mentioned he tried to establish a fair market price—the price is \$1.35 AUM if you lease lands for grazing from the U.S. Government. But if you lease lands for grazing from his home State of Idaho, you have to pay \$4.88 for the same thing, and in New Mexico, it is \$3.54.

The average that States charge for the same thing we get \$1.35 for is \$5.58. Why are the States so much smarter than we are? If you rent in the private sector, the national average is \$11.20.

The Senator from Idaho said we are trying to separate the rich from the poor. Nothing of the kind. These people I am talking about—Anheuser-Busch, Newmont—I do not think they argue they are poor, they cannot afford to pay more, for example, than what his State would charge. If they are poor, if people who have 5,000 AUM's, which is all this amendment covers, if they are poor, who are these 97 percent below them? We do not touch anybody except people like Anheuser-Busch, Newmont Mining, William Hewlett, J.R. Simplot, the biggest corporations, wealthiest people in America.

I do not blame them. I would get land for \$1.35 before I would lease it from the State of Idaho for \$4.88, or lease it from somebody who owned land for \$11.20. All we are trying to do is say, if you want this land, fine, we will give you 5,000 AUM's at this ridiculously low price. If you go above that, you will have to pay a little more.

We all know what this is. I heard all of this debate yesterday about all these poor little ranchers. The poor little ranchers out there are not touched under this amendment. They can graze 418 head every month for 12 months. Most permittees do not graze livestock on the Federal lands for 12 months. Most of them only graze about 5 months a year, so you have to have 1,000 head on most of this land before you even get touched by this. If you have 1,000 head, you ain't poor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to table the Bumpers amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll on the motion to table.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

#### YEAS—50

Abraham	Dorgan	Kyl
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Lott
Baucus	Feinstein	Lugar
Bennett	Frahm	Mack
Bingaman	Frist	McCain
Bond	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Gramm	Murkowski
Bryan	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Reid
Cochran	Hatfield	Shelby
Conrad	Heflin	Simpson
Coverdell	Helms	Stevens
Craig	Hutchison	Thomas
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thompson
Daschle	Kassebaum	Thurmond
Domenici	Kempthorne	

#### NAYS—50

Akaka	Gregg	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Hollings	Pell
Bradley	Inouye	Pryor
Breaux	Jeffords	Robb
Bumpers	Johnston	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Roth
Chafee	Kerrey	Santorum
Coats	Kerry	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kohl	Simon
DeWine	Lautenberg	Smith
Dodd	Leahy	Snowe
Exon	Levin	Specter
Feingold	Lieberman	Warner
Ford	Mikulski	Wellstone
Glenn	Moseley-Braun	Wyden
Graham	Moynihan	

The motion to lay on the table amendment No. 5353, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. And the yeas and nays have been ordered on

H.R. 3816, the energy and water appropriations bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we vote now on the amendment.

Mr. President, this vote having been 50 to 50 on the motion to table, and the order having been that we vote on or in relation to the amendment, it seems at least to this Senator that the logical course of action would be to vote now on the amendment and then to vote on the energy and water bill thereafter. As a consequence, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to vote on the Bumpers-Gregg amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I think it would be well to debate this amendment awhile longer. I am not prepared to vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BUMPERS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the regular order, the vote now occurs, as previously agreed, on the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 3816, the energy and water appropriations bill. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

#### YEAS—92

Abraham	Frahm	Mack
Akaka	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Glenn	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Nunn
Bradley	Harkin	Pell
Breaux	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Santorum
Coats	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Shelby
Cohen	Jeffords	Simon
Conrad	Johnston	Simpson
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Snowe
D'Amato	Kennedy	Specter
Daschle	Kerrey	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Exon	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feinstein	Lott	Wyden
Ford	Lugar	

#### NAYS—8

Brown	Feingold	McCain
Bryan	Kerry	Roth
Faircloth	Kyl	

#### CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I was recorded as an "aye" on the previous vote. I meant to be recorded as "nay." I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as a "nay." This would not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. KERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, obviously, under normal circumstances, we would now go back to the Bumpers-Gregg amendment on grazing fees. The Senator from Arkansas, and I think the Senator from New Mexico as well, wish a little time before we do that. I believe it totally appropriate to grant that time.

Second, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska wants about 15 minutes to speak on the former Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. I will soon make a unanimous-consent request that about 15 minutes be devoted to that subject. After that point, I will ask we set this amendment aside and be ready to go to other amendments on the subject.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Excuse me, the Senator from Alaska is here, so I ask unanimous consent the Senate grant 15 minutes to the Senator from Alaska or his designee to speak on the recently retired Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask, upon conclusion of the Senator's remarks, I be recognized for purposes of offering an amendment.

Mr. GORTON. I object to that, Mr. President, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.